

09/917,539

P-3611-2-D1-3-C1

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application and the following remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1 to 30 are currently pending, and no claims have been amended.

The Final Office Action mailed April 14, 2003 addressed claims 1 to 30. Claims 1 to 30 were rejected. The Advisory Action mailed June 20, 2003 maintained the rejections.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner stated that "Cavallaro '191 does not show or teach specifically that the addition of a mantle layer "increases" or decreases the spin rate but merely says the mantle layer has the affect on playing characteristics such as spin and etc. Note, Cavallaro '191 shows a spin rates on Table II which are tested with a Driver while the spin rate on Table III of Sullivan '489 are tested with a #9 iron; thus, it is not a proper comparison and drawn conclusion." Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner omits that Cavallaro '191, in Table III, shows the effect of spin with an 8 iron, and the results are the same (spin rate increases for the golf balls of the invention).

Additionally, Cavallaro does teach that increased spin rate is preferable. In the Background section, Cavallaro states, when discussing traditional two piece balls, that "due to their hardness, these balls have a relatively low spin rate which makes them difficult to control." Cavallaro states that wound balls are preferred for advanced players because of "superior spin", and they "provide more spin", and the invention will try to make a ball more like a wound ball (i.e., more spin). See column 1, lines 38 to 63. Clearly, contrary to the assertions of the Examiner, Cavallaro is interested in increasing the spin rate of the ball, not decreasing it. Furthermore, although Cavallaro and Sullivan use different clubs to measure spin rate, Applicants respectfully submit that the comparison is proper and a conclusion can be drawn from the comparison. The absolute numbers may not necessarily be compared, but the direction (or increase) can be compared, particularly between an 8 iron and a 9 iron, which are similar.

As previously stated, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching or suggestion in Cavallaro '191 or Sullivan to motivate one skilled in the art to add a mantle to the golf ball of Sullivan. One skilled in the art would not be motivated to add a mantle layer to the golf ball of Sullivan because Sullivan specifically teaches a two piece golf ball

09/917,539

P-3611-2-D1-3-C1

having a large core and a larger, thicker cover, and it is the combination of the soft core and thicker cover that provides the good feel and lower spin in Sullivan. Applicants respectfully submit that Sullivan teaches away from adding another layer by providing a soft core for the soft feel and the thicker cover, and a resulting golf ball having good feel and reduced spin. Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would not be motivated by Cavallaro '191 to add a mantle, specifically the mantle of Cavallaro '191, to Sullivan because the addition of the mantle of Cavallaro '191 increases the spin rate, and the focus of Sullivan is to decrease the spin rate, and Sullivan's combination of core and cover does this.

The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney if it is deemed that a telephone conversation will hasten prosecution of the application.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of each of the presently rejected claims, claims 1 to 30. Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1 to 30, the claims currently pending.

Respectfully submitted,

R. DENNIS NESBITT ET AL.

Customer No. 24492  
Phone (413) 322-2937

Date: June 26, 2003

By: Michelle Bugbee  
Michelle Bugbee, Reg. No. 42,370  
The Top-Flite Golf Company  
Attorney for Applicants  
425 Meadow Street  
P.O. Box 901  
Chicopee, MA 01021-0901

Cc: Richard M. Klein, Esquire (SLD 2 0158-1)